



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/765,675 | 01/22/2001 | Veronique Douin | 05725.0830 | 6349 | |
| 22852 | 7590 12/14/2005 | | EXAMINER | | |
| FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER | | | YU, GINA C | | |
| LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | | | 1617 | | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 12/14/2009 | 5 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|-----------------|--------------|
| 09/765,675 | DOUIN ET AL. |
| Examiner | Art Unit |
| Gina C. Yu | 1617 |

| Doloro alo i lillig of all Appeal Blici | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Gina C. Yu | 1617 | | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 14 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI | S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F | OR ALLOWANCE. | | | | | | |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a N (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compfollowing time periods: | on the same day as filing a Notice of owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in | f Appeal. To avoid at ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (| ence, which CFR 41.31; or | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | | | |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | | | | | | | | |
| | pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be | e filed within two mon | the of the date | | | | | |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). | | | | | | | | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | | | | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); | | | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or | tter form for appeal by materially re | | the issues for | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)) | | jected claims. | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | □ will not be entered, or b) □ wovided below or appended. | vill be entered and an | explanation of | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> . Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> . | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-62 and 64-83</u> . | | | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <i>None</i> . AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | ut before or on the date of filing a land sufficient reasons why the affida | Notice of Appeal will <u>r</u> vit or other evidence | not be entered is necessary | | | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. \$ | al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d) | ils to provide a 1). | | | | | |
| 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control | | • | | | | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered by See attached. | | • 0 | nce because: | | | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other: | (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper | (b)(s). | | | | | | |
| | J. | 100 mans | llon | | | | | |
| | SREE Supervio | ni frontorabhar Toga Lallot Exar | iner Iner | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Art Unit: 1617

Continuation of No. 11:

Examiner maintains the position that the claimed invention is *unpatentable* as obvious over the cited prior arts for the reasons of record. The outstanding obviousness rejection is not based on the ground that the skilled artisan would have "modified" the Restle composition in some way; rather, a skilled in the art would have had "combined" the teachings of the prior arts to achieve the claimed invention, as the claimed invention is viewed so closely identical to the prior art. See MPEP § 2142.

Applicants argue that turbidity and "appearance" are not the same. The argument is erroneous. Turbidity is a measure of the clarity of a solution, which affects the appearance of the composition. While applicants reply on the statement on Knowlton which teaches that particle size may not be the only factor which affects the turbidity, there is nothing in the record for the present applicants to indicate that the claimed turbidity somehow is an unexpected or nonobvious property of the claimed nanoemulsion.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Application/Control Number: 09/765,675

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Page 3

examiner should be directed to Gina C. Yu whose telephone number is 571-272-

8605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from

9:00AM until 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gina Yu

Patent Examiner